

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/779,558	02/09/2001	Yuichi Itoh	1254-0170P	6155
2292	7590 12/31/2003		EXAM	INER
BIRCH STE	EWART KOLASCH &	EGWIM, KELECHI CHIDI		
PO BOX 747	RCH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FALLS CHC	KCII, VA 22040-0747		1713	

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/779,558	ITOH ET AL.	,
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dr. Kelechi C. Egwim	1713	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]
 a)
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>19 November 2003</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE:
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: None.
Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> .
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8,11-13 and 17-20</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 9,10,14-16 and 21-24.
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)
10. Other:
KELECHI C. EGWIM PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See final rejection. Firstly, contrary to the conclusion drawn by applicant from the chart presented on page 14 of the response, the only data that is presented and useful in comparing the oils represented in the chart are flash-point and density. While, based on the comparison of these two properties, the paraffins of Rinehart and Matthews et al. are comparable with that of the oil of comparative example 3 (c-3) in applicant's specifications, it is also noted that these properties of the c-3 (flash-point and density) are just as comparable with the invention reprehensive oils of applicant's examples 1 and 2. No conclusion unexpected results or properties can be drawn from this chart since applicant's own oils also have properties (flash point and density) comparable with the comparative c-3 oil.

Secondly, regarding the molecular weight of the prior art oils, it is noted that no molecular weight requirements are recited in the present claims. Further, no molecular weight information is provided for applicant's inventive oils to even do a one-to-one comparison. In order to show unexpected results, applicant must provide a one-to-one comparison of the prior art and applicant's composition with regard to the properties in the claim.

Finally the clams are not just rejected based on Rinehart and Mathews et al. The presently claim are also rejected based on Abdou-Sabet et al., Sezaki et al. and Otawa et al., individually.

The rejections are maintained as stated in the Final rejection.